

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, amends claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12 to more appropriately claim Applicant's invention, and adds new claims 13 and 14 to protect additional aspects of the invention. No new matter is added. Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending in this application.

Before turning to the present Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide in the next Office Action the status of a Petition to Withdraw Preliminary Amendment which was filed on July 25, 2001. To date, Applicant has not received a response regarding the status of the Petition.

In the Office Action dated July 16, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Usui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,039). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

To properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2121 (8th ed., Aug. 2001), *quoting* Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Finally, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th ed. 2001), p. 2100-69.

Usui discloses an IC card-type radio communication device. See Abstract. As disclosed by Usui, a communication device 1, as depicted in Fig. 6, includes a connector 14, attribute memory 221, a portable phone circuit 222, and an antenna 13. Fig. 3 shows communication device 1, including an upper part body of equipment 11, a

lower part body of equipment 12, and the antenna 13. The lower part body of equipment is shaped according to the JEIDA/PCMA standard, and includes a 68-pin connector 14 for connecting communication device 1 to personal computer 2. See col. 7, lines 9-12. As disclosed by Usui, the lower part body of equipment 12 corresponds to an IC card. Fig. 3 shows that attribute memory 221 is provided on the lower part body of equipment 12, while the portable phone circuit 222 and the antenna 13 are included on upper part body of equipment 11. As previously indicated, however, the IC card included in communication device 1 corresponds to the lower part body of equipment 12.

By contrast, claim 1 recites an IC card including, among other things, “a controller configured to control access to the memory and to control the radio frequency circuit” and “a connector connected to the radio frequency circuit and attachable to and detachable from an antenna module having an antenna.” Usui does not anticipate at least these features of claim 1. Instead, Usui depicts a communication device as described above wherein the IC card is included in a lower portion of the device and is not connectable to an antenna. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Independent claims 5, 7, 8, and 11 include recitations of a similar scope as claim 1. For example, claim 5 recites an antenna module including “a connector to be connected to an IC card that has a radio interface unit” and “an antenna to be connected to the radio interface unit.” Claim 7 recites an IC card including, among other things, “a radio frequency circuit connected to the antenna.” Claim 8 recites a “data processing apparatus having a slot for inserting therein an IC card” including, among

other things, "an antenna incorporated in a casing of the data processing apparatus."
Claim 11 recites an IC card including, among other things, "a radio frequency circuit to be connected to a first antenna" and "an antenna connecting terminal to be connected to a second antenna that is provided in a data processing apparatus."

Accordingly, Usui does not anticipate independent claims 5, 7, 8, and 11 for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with allowable claim 1.
Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow claims 5, 7, 8, and 11.

Claims 3-4 and 13; 6 and 14; 9 and 10; and 12 depend from allowable claims 1, 5, 8, and 11. Usui does not anticipate these dependent claims at least due to the same reasons discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims.
Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow these dependent claims.

Finally, new claims 13 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively.
Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable claims 1 and 5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 16, 2003

By: Anthony Indurzi Reg. No. 53,232
for Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com